

REMARKS

Each independent claim has been amended to include the feature that each client module is assigned to a remote device of a different type, and the remote devices are able to navigate the electronic program guide on the receiver.

This has the advantage that multiple users can access the receiver's Electronic Program Guide (EPG) on different remote devices without disturbing the viewing of a particular program, and the view of the EPG will be formatted to the corresponding display on the remote device, in contrast to the prior art in which the EPG is displayed on the television instead of or on top of the program which thereby disrupts the viewing thereof. It is believed the amendments moot the obviousness rejection.

With respect to Ma, this document describes a PDA which is configured to receive an EPG from a set-top box (STB) and update the same with reference to information provided via the internet. However, there is no disclosure of a server module capable of formatting the EPG for display on different types of remote device. Therefore, disadvantageously if the user loses or changes their PDA as taught by Ma, they have no other remote means of viewing the EPG.

With regard to Markman, this document describes a media center server which may provide EPG information for display on a plurality of televisions. However, all of the televisions are identical, and there is no disclosure of the server module being capable of formatting the EPG information for display on different types of remote device. Indeed, Markman teaches away from the invention as the system is described as being scalable (paragraph 50) which means that the televisions connected thereto must all be the same to provide such scalability, and there is therefore no requirement for providing the EPG information in multiple formats.

With respect to Plotnick, this document describes a program listing server which is accessible via the internet by a PDA and an STB, each of which independently create EPGs from the data provided. The PDA can be used to set reminders on the STB, but as the EPGs are created independently, there is a problem that the EPGs may be mismatched, if for example one had been updated with program data at a different time to the other. In contrast, the present invention allows the remote device to navigate the EPG on the receiver STB, so there is no risk of such a mismatch occurring. In addition, Plotnick suffers from the same problem as Ma, in that if a different device other than a PDA is used, there is no teaching to suggest that the EPG can be provided to an alternative type of device in the appropriate format.

Thus, none of the prior art documents cited teach a receiver comprising at least two client modules, each client module being assigned to a different type of remote device, such that the electronic program guide on the receiver can be navigated by the different types of remote devices. As such, the invention described by the amended claims is not obvious as it achieves results not achievable by the prior art, using elements not shown by the prior art.


Conclusion

This is a request to extend the period for filing a response in the above-identified application for one month from August 13, 2010 to September 13, 2010. Applicant is a large entity; therefore, please charge Deposit Account No. 26-0084 in the amount of \$130.00 to cover the cost of the one month extension.

No other fees or extensions of time are believed to be due in connection with this amendment; however, consider this a request for any extension inadvertently omitted, and charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 26-0084.

Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Edmund J. Sease".

EDMUND J. SEASE, Reg. No. 24,741
McKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C.
801 Grand Avenue, Suite 3200
Des Moines, Iowa 50309-2721
Phone No: (515) 288-3667
Fax No: (515) 288-1338
CUSTOMER NO: 22885

Attorneys of Record

- bjh -